

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/769,833	02/02/2004	Steven G. Taylor	COM 1013-079C	9077
8698	7590 06/22/2005		EXAMINER	
STANDLEY LAW GROUP LLP 495 METRO PLACE SOUTH			KAUFMAN, JOSEPH A	
SUITE 210			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
DUBLIN, O	PH 43017		3754	
			DATE MAIL ED: 06/22/2004	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

				4			
		Application No.	Applicant(s)				
Office Action Summary		10/769,833	TAYLOR, STEVEN G.				
		Examiner	Art Unit				
		Joseph A. Kaufman	3754				
Period fo	The MAILING DATE of this communica or Reply	ition appears on the cover sheet	with the correspondence address				
THE - Exterent after - If the - If NC - Failu Any	ORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICANS of time may be available under the provisions of SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication of the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) or period for reply is specified above, the maximum statuth or to reply within the set or extended period for reply will reply received by the Office later than three months after the patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ATION. 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may ication. lays, a reply within the statutory minimum of to ory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MI, by statute, cause the application to become	a reply be timely filed hirty (30) days will be considered timely. ONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).				
Status	•						
1)	Responsive to communication(s) filed	on					
2a)☐	This action is FINAL . 2b)	This action is non-final.					
3)□	Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.						
Disposit	ion of Claims						
5)□ 6)⊠ 7)□	Claim(s) 1-20 is/are pending in the app 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are Claim(s) is/are allowed. Claim(s) 1-20 is/are rejected. Claim(s) is/are objected to. Claim(s) are subject to restriction	withdrawn from consideration.		·			
Applicat	ion Papers						
9)[The specification is objected to by the E	Examiner.					
10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.							
	Applicant may not request that any objection	on to the drawing(s) be held in abey	ance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).				
11)□	Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the The oath or declaration is objected to be	•					
Priority (ınder 35 U.S.C. § 119						
a)	Acknowledgment is made of a claim for All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority do 2. Certified copies of the priority do 3. Copies of the certified copies of application from the International See the attached detailed Office action to	ocuments have been received. Ocuments have been received in Ocuments have been the priority documents have been the large (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	Application No en received in this National Stage				
Attachmen	t(s)						
2) Notice 3) Inform	ee of References Cited (PTO-892) se of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTC mation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PT or No(s)/Mail Date	9-948) Paper N	v Summary (PTO-413) o(s)/Mail Date f Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) 				

Information Disclosure Statement

1. The information disclosure statement filed 2/2/2005 fails to comply with 37 CFR 1.98(a)(2), which requires a legible copy of each cited foreign patent document; each non-patent literature publication or that portion which caused it to be listed; and all other information or that portion which caused it to be listed. It has been placed in the application file, but the information referred to therein has not been considered.

Contrary to applicant's assertion, the references were not made of record in the parent case and, therefore, the copies need to be provided.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

2. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

- (e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.
- 3. Claims 1-4, 8, 10-12 and 15-19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Baerenwald.

Baerenwald shows a base 24c; post 84c; lever 28c hinged to the base having a front portion extending into the container and rear portion 78c; cover 58c; annular structure 90c that surrounds the bottom post portion that has a greater cross-sectional area than the thinner bottom post portion; wall with opening seen in Figure 33; sealing portion around edge 28c; limit structure/backstop as the wall seen in Figure 31; the end

Art Unit: 3754

of the base forms the spout/pouring edge; the "beak" is the end edge of the lever that opens the container; and as the annular structure surrounds the base portion of the post, it forms a "ring".

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
 - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 5. Claims 5-7, 13, 14 and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Baerenwald.

Baerenwald has been discussed above, but lacks the rearward portion being longer than the frontward portion and the specific dimensions. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to make the rearward portion longer than the frontward (therefore extending beyond the base) in order to provide a greater moment arm to allow for easier actuating of the opening device. Further, the specific dimensions of the pour zone would have been obvious dependent on the desired rate of dispensing.

Double Patenting

6. The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. See *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and, *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

Art Unit: 3754

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent is shown to be commonly owned with this application. See 37 CFR 1.130(b).

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

7. Claims 1-20 are rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-11 of U.S. Patent No. 6,685,055. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because the current claims are merely broader recitations of the previously presented claims.

Conclusion

- 8. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Vestering, Duvander et al., and Wrigley show other container opening devices.
- 9. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Joseph A. Kaufman whose telephone number is (571) 272-4928. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday, 5:30AM-2PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Michael Mar can be reached on (571) 272-4906. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Application/Control Number: 10/769,833

Art Unit: 3754

Page 5

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Joseph A/ Kaufmar Primary Examiner

Art Unit 3754

6/20/05

jak June 20, 2005